UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,384	06/08/2007 Uwe Skultety-Betz		10191/4513	7300
26646 KENYON & K	7590 03/24/201 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV	VAY	IGYARTO, CAROLYN		
NEW YORK, N	NI 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2884	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/24/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/587,384	SKULTETY-BETZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

		CAROLYN IGYART	-O	2884	
The MAILING DATE of this commun	nication appea	ars on the cover sh	eet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 March 2011 FAILS TO PL	ACE THIS API	PLICATION IN CON	DITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but this application, applicant must timely file or places the application in condition for allows a Request for Continued Examination (RCE time periods:	t prior to or on ne of the follow ance; (2) a Not	the same day as fili ring replies: (1) an a tice of Appeal (with a	ng a Notice of mendment, aff appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a)	ng date of this Ao or reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) thater than SIX MONTHS	from the mailin	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.13 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expirat set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3 NOTICE OF APPEAL	36(a). The date of the period of ext ion date of the s of the Office later	on which the petition un ension and the corresp hortened statutory peri than three months afte	oonding amount iod for reply orig	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office.	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a) a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply AMENDMENTS)), or any exter	nsion thereof (37 CF	R 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	s of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a fi (a) They raise new issues that would reque (b) They raise the issue of new matter (so (c) They are not deemed to place the appropriate appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims withou	uire further cor ee NOTE belov olication in bett	nsideration and/or se w); ter form for appeal b	earch (see NO y materially re	TE below);	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 4. The amendments are not in compliance wite 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amended claim seed the proposed amended c	ee 37 CFR 1.11 th 37 CFR 1.12 ng rejection(s):would be all	16 and 41.33(a)). 21. See attached No owable if submitted	tice of Non-Co	empliant Amendment of timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
how the new or amended claims would be r The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as for Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ejected is prov			in be emered and arre	Apidination of
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a f because applicant failed to provide a showir was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.1 	ng of good and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the entered because the affidavit or other evide showing a good and sufficient reasons why 	nce failed to or it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejection vand was not earlier	ns under appe presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	·			•	
 The request for reconsideration has been a See Continuation Sheet. 		•		n condition for allowar	ice because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure</i> \$13. ☐ Other:	Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper I	No(s)		
/David P. Porta/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2884					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: At least the new limitations of the information on which the optimization is based includes an identification of a material of the at least one object would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed 03 March 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the official notice was not presented in office action dated April 26, 2010. However, the same known in the art statement (official notice) was presented in paragraph 35 of the office action mailed 4/26/2010. Applicant has not adequately traversed the official notice regarding optimization of one sensor based on information from another sensor. Adequate traversal of such findings includes stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. In regards to the drawing objections, Applicant has misinterpreted 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings "must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims".

In regards to the enablement requirement under 35 USC 112, in order to make a rejection, the examiner has the initial burden to establish a reasonable basis to question the enablement provided for the claimed invention (2164.04). The minimal requirement is for the examiner to give reasons for the uncertainty of the enablement. While the analysis and conclusion of a lack of enablement are based on the factors discussed in MPEP § 2164.01(a) and the evidence as a whole, it is not necessary to discuss each factor in the written enablement rejection. The language should focus on those factors, reasons, and evidence that lead the examiner to conclude that the specification fails to teach how to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation, or that the scope of any enablement provided to one skilled in the art is not commensurate with the scope of protection sought by the claims. In the instant application the disclosure does not seem to provide adequate direction or guidance for one of ordinary skill to fill in the gaps that have not been explicitly disclosed.

The remarks regarding the amendment will not be addressed at this time, because this amendment has not been entered, as explained above..